IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.SIRI JAGAN

TUESDAY, THE 17TH JULY 2007 / 26TH ASHADHA 1929

WP(C).No. 21970 of 2007(M)

PETITIONER:

FABINA N.A.,
NADUVILAPARAMBIL, KARINGAMTHURUTH,
KONGORPILLY, ERNAKULAM-683 525.

BY ADV. SMT.AYSHA YOUSEFF
SMT.MOLLY JACOB
SRI.M.KABANI DINESH

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. COCHIN UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE &
TECHNOLOGY, REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR,
THRIKKAKARA.

2. DIRECTOR,
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS & ACADEMIC ADMINISSIONS,
COCHIN UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY,
THRIKKAKARA.

3. JOINT CONTROLLER OF TECHNICAL
EXAMINATIONS, KERALA, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI. I.V. PRAMOD
SRI.A.A. ABDUL HASSAN - SC

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 17/07/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

S. SIRI JAGAN, J.

W.P.(C)NO. 21970 OF 2007

DATED THIS THE 17th DAY OF JULY, 2007

JUDGMENT

The petitioner applied for B.Tech (Civil) Lateral Entry Course 2007 in the 1st respondent University. As per the prospectus the petitioner was required to produce the mark list of the qualifying examinations on the date of counselling. The counselling was conducted on 27.6.07. However, since the results of the qualifying examinations were not declared, the petitioner could not produce the mark list. Although the petitioner produced the mark list on 28.6.07, later on, it was refused to be considered on the ground that the same was not produced at the time of counselling. The petitioner would contend that although the counselling was scheduled on 27.6.07 morning, it was actually conducted at 8.30 p.m. on that day. The petitioner, therefore, seeks a direction to the 1st respondent to give the petitioner admission to one of the available seats.

2. I am not inclined to entertain this writ petition primarily on account of delay. Admittedly, the petitioner got the mark list on 28.6.2007 and the counselling was on 27.6.07. The petitioner has not approached this Court within a reasonable time. By this time the

counselling must have been over.

3. Further the learned standing counsel appearing for the University submits that there are no vacant seats in which the petitioner can be given admission. In the above circumstances, I am not inclined to exercise my discretionary jurisdiction in favour of the petitioner.

Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

S. SIRI JAGAN, JUDGE

Acd